



**State  
Workforce  
Innovation  
Board**



New Hampshire Department of  
**BUSINESS AND  
ECONOMIC AFFAIRS**

---

**State Workforce Innovation Board (SWIB)  
Program Year 2020 Meeting**

**October 19, 2021  
1:00pm**

**Board Members in Attendance:**

Christine Brennan

Anya Burzynski

David Cioffi

Kelly Clark

Commissioner Copadis

Dwight Davis

Julie Demers

Beth Doiron

William Hatch

John Hennessy

Jay Kahn \*1:15 arrival

Michael Kane

Mayor Lovett

Jonathan Melanson

Jim Proulx

Tim Sink

Mike Somers

Gary Thomas

**Guest Speakers**

Chris Santaniello

Rich Lavers

Brian Gottlob

**Guests**

Lisa Hinson-Hatz

Lauren Smith

Kimberly Runion

Sarah Morrissey

Sarah Wheeler

**Staff**

Joseph Doiron

Jimmie Hinson

Laura LeCain

Lisa Gerrard

Melissa Salmon

Barbara Shea

## **Agenda**

1. 1:00pm--Call to Order:
  - 1a. Roll Call
  - 1b. Approval of June 8, 2021 Meeting Minutes
  - 1c. Welcome
  - 1d. Public Comment
  
2. 1:10pm—Informational Items
  - 2a. Presentation from NH DHHS Associate Commissioner Christine Santaniello & NHES Deputy Commissioner Richard Lavers
  - 2b. Financial Update
  - 2c. Rapid Response Update
  - 2d. Program Performance Update
  - 2e. WIOA Annual Monitoring Summary
  - 2f. Program Success Stories
  - 2g. Subcommittee Reports
    1. Bylaws Subcommittee Report
    2. Review Subcommittee Report
  - 2h. National Health Emergency Grant Closeout
  - 2i. VIP Grant Discussion
  - 2j. Combined State Plan Revisions
  
3. 2:30pm—Board Motions & Discussion
  - 3a. Approval of SWIB Meeting Calendar
  - 3b. Vote on changes to Bylaws discussed June 8, 2021
  - 3c. WIOA Master Budget and Distribution of Funds for PY2021 Funds
  - 3d. WIOA Youth Incentive Policy
  - 3e. Workforce Discussion Request from June 8, 2021 Meeting
  - 3f. Topics for the February 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting
  - 3g. Board Motions and General Discussion

4:00pm—Adjourn

P R O C E E D I N G S

\* \* \* \* \*

MICHAEL KANE: Thank you, Joe. And thank you to the members of the Board who are joining us here today. For the record, I am Michael Kane, Chairman of the State Workforce Innovation Board.

Some quick notes as we begin the meeting. This meeting is recorded. Before speaking, please state your name so that the transcription service can accurately document today's meeting. Today's meeting is an official meeting of the Board, is open to the public, and will be run in a manner compliant with RSA 91-A. Has everyone read 91-A?

Meeting materials for the Board and the public can be found by visiting NH Works webpage [blah, blah, blah]. Again, today's meeting is being recorded. Thank you.

JOE DOIRON: Mr. Chairman, would you like me to start the roll?

MICHAEL KANE: Absolutely.

JOE DOIRON: And again, for the record this is Joe Doiron. We're going to start with the roll call for

attendance alphabetically.

Mike Alberts?

[Pause]

Beth Doiron?

BETH DOIRON: Here.

JOE DOIRON: Eric Bachelor?

[Pause]

JOE DOIRON: Mark Beaudoin?

[Pause]

Christine Brennan?

CHRISTINE BRENNAN: Present.

JOE DOIRON: Thank you. Anya Burzynski?

ANYA BURZYNSKI: Here.

JOE DOIRON: Thank you. David Cioffi?

DAVID CIOFFI: Here.

JOE DOIRON: Thank you. Kelly Clark?

KELLY CLARK: Here.

JOE DOIRON: George Copadis?

GEORGE CAPADIS: Here.

JOE DOIRON: Dwight Davis?

DWIGHT DAVIS: Here.

JOE DOIRON: Julie Demers?

JULIE DEMERS: Here.

JOE DOIRON: William Hatch?

WILLIAM HATCH: Here.

JOE DOIRON: John Hennessey?

JOHN HENNESSEY: Here.

JOE DOIRON: Jay Kahn?

[Pause]

JOE DOIRON: Mickael Kane?

CHAIRMAN MICKAEL KANE: Here.

JOE DOIRON: Tamer Koheil?

[Pause]

JOE DOIRON: Charlene Lovett?

MAYOR CHARLENE LOVETT: Here.

JOE DOIRON: Robert Martel?

[Pause]

JOE DOIRON: Jonathan Melanson?

JONATHAN MELANSON: Here.

JOE DOIRON: Steve Norton?

[Pause]

JOE DOIRON: Eric Proulx?

[Pause]

JOE DOIRON: Jim Proulx?

JIM PROULX: Here.

JOE DOIRON: Tim Sink?

TIM SINK: Here.

JOE DOIRON: Mike Somers?

MIKE SOMERS: Here.

JOE DOIRON: Gary Thomas?

GARY THOMAS: Here.

JOE DOIRON: Michael Turmelle?

[Pause]

JOE DOIRON: Brandon Wagner?

[Pause]

JOE DOIRON: Mr. Chairman, roll call complete.

We have a quorum.

MICHAEL KANE: Great. The meeting minutes from June 8 are found in your packet. If there are no edits, I will accept the motion to approve the meeting minutes from June 8.

TIM SINK: So move.

DAVID CIOFFI: Second.

MAYOR LOVETT: Mr. Chair? I had several comments that I already sent to Joe.

MICHAEL KANE: Okay.

MAYOR LOVETT: And I was told to read them for the consideration of the Board.

MICHAEL KANE: Could you state your name for the recording?

MAYOR LOVETT: I'm sorry. Yes. My name is Charlene Lovett. So after reviewing the minutes, the corrections that I sent forward were page 10, third paragraph. It was written, "She fell off the track a little bit and pursued" should probably be changed to, "She fell off the track a little bit in the pursuit of career goals." Page 65 first paragraph change, "Concord" to "Claremont." Page 83, fifth paragraph, I believe, "Upper Valley Community College" should read, "River Valley Community College." Page 89 first line, "We were all wanting seven days a week" should probably be changed to, "We were all working seven days a week." And that's all I have, Mr. Chair.

MICHAEL KANE: Thank you very much. So should we --

JOE DOIRON: We can vote; we don't need to do a roll call, sir.

MICHAEL KANE: Yeah. Everyone -- all in favor?



[COLLECTIVE: Aye]

MICHAEL KANE: Anyone opposed?

[Pause]

MICHAEL KANE: Great. Actually, I'll just keep going here. I'd like to welcome everyone here today. My name is Michal Kane as I said earlier. I serve as the Chairman of the State Workforce Innovation Board, and it's great to see so many Board members here.

I appreciate you all being here with us today, because I know everyone's schedules are very busy. We have a full agenda, and lots of information to cover. Workforce is a critical issue facing New Hampshire, and the Board plays a critical role in this area, so let's get started.

JOE DOIRON: We just have to do the 1d requirement for public comment.

MICHAEL KANE: We would like to take a moment to see if anyone from the public would like to provide any public comment. If so, please state your name prior to speaking.

[Pause]

MICHAEL KANE: Okay. All right. We start our

agenda here today with this -- with some informational items. These are reports and updates provided to the Board. These do not require a vote; however, if Board members would like to make motions, I would ask you to please wait until the next section on our agenda. Please remember before speaking, please state your name for the recording.

Joe, could you please guide us through these items?

JOE DOIRON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. [Again, for the record Joe Doiron.] We're going to welcome Associate Commissioner Christine Santaniello and Deputy Commissioner Richard Lavers for some informational materials. And then we're going to welcome Brian Gottlob from New Hampshire Employment Security as well after. So we have two presentations for the Board.

CHRIS SANTANIELLO: So I'm Chris Santaniello, and I'm here to talk about two things actually. First is the Council on Housing Stability and our strategic plan, because I definitely -- and Commissioner Copadis is on that -- Rich Lavers participates, there's someone from DEO. So we have a lot of community participation and it definitely

impacts Workforce Housing. So I'm going to try to do this here.

Okay. So the Council on Housing Stability was created in November, the Friday before Thanksgiving -- thank you, Jonathan Melanson -- by Governor Sununu for the purpose of creating and implementing a plan to create housing stability for all citizens.

And this actually replaced -- there used to be an interagency Coordinating Council on Homelessness. But homelessness is the problem, not the solution, right? And so we really wanted to be solutions focused when it came to thinking about housing and housing instability.

And so there's 41 members of the Councils. And I think what's critical -- what's important to note with the Council is it's co-led by the Department of Health and Human Services, by Commissioner Caswell at the Department for Business and Economic Affairs and the Community Development Finance Authority. Because we recognize that housing crosses all citizens in Non-Hispanic -- Workforce, homelessness, families, and so we really wanted to create housing stability across the board.

And we have four working groups to really help us

with developing our strategic plan. And I see Brian back there, and he was involved, and we were actually on a call yesterday and we focused on housing instability and homeless in data, as well as planning, regulation and regional coordination.

So despite our really low unemployment numbers here in New Hampshire, and our really strong economy, we have a lack of affordable housing. And I'm sure many of you in the Workforce are like, "How do we bring in new workers when we have housing concerns as well as high cost of housing?"

And so construction has not moved forward since the great recession of 2008. But yet demand has continued to increase. Our median rental costs have been increasing. You can see the median rent across all of the counties here in New Hampshire. And we require the fifteenth highest wage in the nation to afford our housing. And that comes out to be about \$23 an hour to maintain a two-bedroom home.

And I think about a lot of the individuals and families we bring into New Hampshire; you want people to buy a home, become part of their community and stay invested in their community. And New Hampshire Housing

Finance Authority estimates that about 20,000 more units are needed in order to fill our permanent housing gap, which does not get to the future.

So what we were charged with was developing a plan for housing stability for three years for the state, which I think you have in your packet? Okay. And as well as looking at creating a plan for homelessness.

So we know that housing ends homelessness and creates stability, so that's our vision. We also know that greater access to affordable housing is going to assist New Hampshire's businesses and strengthen our economy. We know that individuals and families experiencing homelessness and housing instability often have other conditions impacting their circumstances.

I think back to in my own life; how many of you all have moved in the last 10 years?

[Pause]

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: And how stressful was that for you?

[Pause]

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: And was it a positive move?

[Pause]

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: So think about a lot of families who are experiencing homelessness; the constant moving and having it not be a -- and having it be stressful and think about their conditions on work, right? How can you focus at work if you have chaos at home?

Housing stability is one of our social determinants of health, and it's essential for all adults and children and families to thrive. And investing in housing is a better solution for individuals, families and communities. Because it creates improved health, social, educational and economic outcomes, right?

We know there's lots of businesses across the state that need workers, and you have -- paired with that is they need affordable housing. And needed services and supports should be delivered in each community, based on the strengths of each community.

So we created a plan to ensure that homelessness is rare, brief and one-time. And in doing that, we recognized that the low supply and high demand makes it really hard for employers to hire and retain workers. And housing demand has the greatest pressure at the lower end

of the market, which creates unstable housing. And so we really need to figure out how to make that stable.

We recognized prior to the pandemic, there was an increase in people experiencing homelessness at 21 percent.

And what's really fascinating on what we learned during the pandemic -- and as we were working with one of the shelters in the Seacoast area, is the high number of people in their shelter who actually had a job; that they just couldn't find or afford housing, and when we were assisting them with some decompression during the pandemic, she actually was able to move some of those individuals into hotels temporarily, so they could continue to work.

So it's not people that are not trying to work, not trying to get ahead, it's just the resources aren't always there. And our unduplicated homeless management system indicates that there's over 4000 people, including children and families, who receive some form of services. So our north star is really ensuring that homelessness is rare, brief and longtime.

So we have some really big picture goals. One of those is to end veteran's homelessness by 2022, reduce first-time homelessness by 30 percent.

What we found in some of our data is the number of people experiencing homelessness, 70 percent of them it's one time. It's their first time. And increase the number of housing units by 13500 by 2024. Again, we need housing to end homelessness.

So what are some things that we're doing to make it happen? We're improving our crisis response service infrastructure and policies that support individuals and families to maintain housing in their communities.

We're also looking at what are the regulatory barriers? There's a lot of barriers in each community that impact affordable housing. We really need to look at the increased production of affordable housing, and we also need to think about how do we handle some private market housing production and really think about existing structure for rental housing.

What about some of the commercial space that isn't needed, and how can we turn that into housing? What about malls that aren't being used? How do you turn that into housing?

We're working on a productive legislative strategy hopefully, that will increase housing production,



and really looking at a governance structure that connects state government with local communities.

Because what we found is in New Hampshire, where we have an immense amount of local control, which we all respect and we want to see happen, how do we make sure we get some statewide strategic initiatives and some best practices across the board?

So we have some one-year strategies, because we have a three-year action plan; a strategic plan, we have a one-year action plan so we can really move forward with a number of our goals.

So what we're really trying to look at is how can we use some of the American Rescue Plan dollars to really help us with those one-time investments. How can we take those dollars that are one-time to build our infrastructure?

We're really working on launching a statewide campaign to recruit private landlords, and really provide some financial incentives for them to work with their local shelters, to take the housing choice vouchers, providing them some of the resources they need to match up with some of the requirements.

Increase our homelessness prevention planning to really talk about shelter diversion. How do we work to not have people come into the shelters? How do we work with our outreach teams as well as our local and municipal welfare agencies, so that we're all working in sync to increase housing stability?

Provide financial support for local communities to make regulatory changes that promote affordable housing development. And some communities are already doing this.

And really looking at coordinated funding applications that provide capital operating in supportive services to reduce the production.

I think what we find a lot is working with communities and social service agencies and developers is by blending and braiding the different funding streams, which is super hard, right? But that really helps us get to the outcomes we want to get to and so providing that.

And then use community input for repurposing of vacant commercial space. I live in the Lakes Region, and so every time I drive by a certain vacant space, I think, "Oh my gosh, this would be phenomenal for housing." And I am trying to get to those developers, right?

So some things we're looking at for collaboration is really some of our cross-systems data to really make sure that communities have the data they need. What's being invested, what are some resources -- how do we make this all work? How do we maximize Medicaid dollars?

Lots of times we have developers who are willing to house some people who may be vulnerable. But what are the supports that person needs to maintain housing? Our goal is to really keep people housed.

Increase leadership opportunities for people with experiences. Fascinating having people who have been homeless sitting at the table. Really develop real-time data and housing needs, and really how do we have -- New Hampshire has three different areas for housing services across the state, and how do we better match them with the regional planning commissions, county government, and all of the services people need to move this agenda forward?

So we're really looking at funds from the American Rescue plan to really help us with some of these one-time costs. We estimate about \$45 million dollars could really help us with the necessary support of the one-time investment. And so we're continuing to work on it.

So that's -- I believe you have our strategic plan. There's lots of information on our website. I know I gave you a lot of information in a really short period of time, but I don't know if anybody has any questions or thoughts?

Yep?

MICHAEL KANE: Tim Sink.

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Okay.

TIM SINK: And there's a bullet point about providing funding for local communities and things that deal with the regulatory issues and --

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Mm-hm.

TIM SINK: -- can you talk a little bit about -- what that would look like?

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: So one of the things where we have to actually get the funds from the American Rescue Fund, but we're actually working really closely with New Hampshire Housing Finance Authority.

And we actually have some staffing support to help communities really figure out, okay, what are some of the -- what are some barriers that need to change? How can we work together? How can we provide some incentives? So

a lot of it would be done through incentive and researching that way. So if you have a community, let us know.

TIM SINK: So this would be funds for the local municipalities?

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Mm-hm.

TIM SINK: Okay. Thank you.

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Yep.

MICHAEL KANE How do you plan to fund the \$13,500 by 2024? Because we worked actually with the Office of Strategic Initiatives. Is that -- I'm looking at Joe, because now it's in your shop, right?

JOE DOIRON: Yeah. It's at the Office of Planning --

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Yeah, so --

JOE DOIRON: -- the Office of Planning and Development, formerly --

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: And Brian helped. We actually looked at what our -- what some of the data coming in to the state, and then we actually increased it a little bit. So it's all done with planning the Office of Planning and Strategic Initiatives.

MICHAEL KANE: So where do we think the money is

coming from?

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: We're hoping to use some of the American Rescue Fund dollars.

MICHAEL KANE: The \$45 million?

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Yes. That's what we're hoping to do. Just because a lot of that money is one-time investments.

MICHAEL KANE: Right.

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: And we know that there's a huge need for people to have housing.

MICHAEL KANE: Do you have an idea of what the -- how much you need to raise to supply \$13,500?

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: I don't have that off the top of my head, but I can get that for you. I can --

MICHAEL KANE: It's about \$2.7 million.

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Yeah. Yeah.

MICHAEL KANE: We should have a strategy to get -

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Huh?

MICHAEL KANE: I'm just thinking we should be a strategy to get that.

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Yeah, yep. We're working on different strategies.

JIM PROULX: [Jim Proulx.]

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Yeah.

JIM PROULX: My question, if you had any examples of recent success where this has been implemented in communities prior to this?

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Yeah. So in the Portsmouth community, they -- through Seacoast United Way, they had a Housing for All, which really combined some supportive services, and the landlord outreach.

So we're looking to replicate some of those statewide with some funding that we're hoping to get to really under -- to work with landlords onto how do we provide those supportive services. So that worked really well.

And then we did a lot of work throughout the pandemic by increasing outreach and really combining all of the social service programs and working in one team. And we did a lot of that work in Manchester, and that was really successful. So we're looking to replicate a lot of those pieces.

JIM PROULX: And I read the plan book; where does transportation fit into the overall plan?

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: [Laughter].

JIM PROULX: And has there been any outreach to the businesses who are desperate for the workers --

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Right.

JIM PROULX: To work in conjunction, whether it's transportation, whether it's housing assistance or --

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Yeah. So that's really why we had throughout the whole development of the strategic plan, we -- that's why we really looked at not having it be just Health and Human Services, right? Because we're just one piece of it. So that's why really you had Business and Economic Affairs at the table. We had over 80 people volunteer on different work groups.

And so one of the pieces that we're continuing to work on is some regional work and regional collaborations, and really working with the local planning commissions, because they're doing housing assessments through part of their regions, so really coordinating all of the work.

And that's where we really are thinking about what are some innovative strategies in working with local communities, because they have some of those resources? They may have a business. And transportation is always a



concern.

And so we have Department of Transportation at the table. And really be thinking about, okay, when we think about, okay how do we use the space, what are all these other pieces that have to be considered? Because that's a real barrier for people is transportation.

Sorry, they are in their packet.

DAVE CIOFFI: [David Cioffi.] When you locate a community that really needs a lot of housing, do you also examine the zoning to find out if there are things you can recommend so that developers are more encouraged to build?

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Yep.

DAVID CIOFFI: Because I see it in our Upper Valley. The zoning holds a lot of these developers back.

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: So that's not me, because I'd been like, "Just do it." No, just kidding. Woops, I'm being recorded. No.

And so that's why through some of our funding we have, New Hampshire Housing Finance Authority will be taking the lead in that, and actually hiring somebody to work with the local communities on some of the zoning regulations for all of those pieces. Because that's what

we're really finding a lot of.

So yeah. So we're looking at all of those strategies, because we really realize it's not -- it isn't something that just happened overnight, right? It's taken time. And so what do we need to do to kind of flip it and turn it the other way?

DWIGHT DAVIS: Dwight Davis. You mentioned commercial properties. We're working on using some commercial properties for homes. What communities have you ever seen a study anywhere in the country that they have been successful doing this?

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: So there has been some. There's some work being done actually in Portsmouth, New Hampshire. And then there's other studies in other places, which I can get for you. That's kind of not my part of this whole piece, but Katie from CDFA has that information, and I can get some of that for you.

DWIGHT DAVIS: The reason I ask that question is because I'm seeing so many malls are shutting down.

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Yep.

DWIGHT DAVIS: You have these huge properties and

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Mm-hm.

DWIGHT DAVIS: I would think that there should be some communities that are doing that already.

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Right. That's what we're looking at. We don't have to recreate the wheel.

MICHAEL KANE: We just have one more question.

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: one more question.

MICHAEL KANE: Two more questions.

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Okay. Yep.

MAYOR LOVETT: Charlene Lovett. What's the strategy for communicating to communities the tools that are out there are really for development? Because in my experience, 79b was the development tool was approved by the Legislature I believe in the early 2000s. But the governing body had to adopt it in that community. While Claremont they adopted it, I think it was 10 or 11 years after it was available. And I think a primary reason for that is I don't know if it was well known --

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Right.

MAYOR LOVETT: -- to the governing body that it was an option. I can tell you every housing development we had since we adopted 79b has been due to the availability

of that tool.

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Mm-hm.

MAYOR LOVETT: So --

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: So we're working -- we actually were able to get some staffing positions through the Governor's Office of Economic Recovery and GOFERR. I can't -- I always mess up my rs. But yeah, to really help with some of that outreach. And outreach is a big piece.

And we actually have a staff position at New Hampshire Housing Finance to work with local communities and provide a lot of that information. So that's really some of our tools that we're trying to use to get some of the information out and provide that consultation.

Yep, Senator Kahn?

JAY KAHN: Hi, Chris. [Jay Kahn.]

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Yeah.

JAY KAHN: Thank you. The Chairman just used a figure, and I think I have been trying to understand what is the investment and what is -- with the state dollars, what is the benefit? So Chairman, if I can just check the figure, you're anticipating about \$200,000 cost per bed?

MICHAEL KANE: Yeah, pretty good.

JAY KAHN: Rough estimate.

MICHAEL KANE: Yeah, yeah.

JAY KAHN: Yeah. Higher than I thought, but I think definitely over \$100,000 but whatever. So if that's the total investment, and the \$45 million is just all of this town --

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Mm-hm, yep --

JAY KAHN: -- is on there, and so trying to understand, then, the benefit to an income challenge household, to be able to afford it and turn the housing into something affordable. The \$45 million supposedly would be used to reduce capital. And that doesn't --

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Mm-hm.

JAY KAHN: -- generate a great discount. So I guess I'm wondering what do we anticipate is the rent? I mean, the benefit is the 20 percent market discount? What are we buying with an investment in affordable housing?

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: So the \$45 million is just a piece to work on a number of the strategies. And increasing the housing units is one piece, but there's a whole slew of different resources that have to be brought to the table -- private -- you know -- developers, local

communities, business, right? Because we can't bring workers into the state if we don't have affordable housing.

And so really looking at it, and that's with some of our data, community by community to determine what is the need in those communities, and how do we really make those, the housing affordable and accessible for our workforce so people stay here in New Hampshire.

MICHAEL KANE: Yeah. We all, we're not giving them the housing, they're going to pay for it.

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Yeah, exactly.

MICHAEL KANE: So it supports some of that, right?

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Yeah.

MICHAEL KANE: And we could probably get real long-term - [\_00:30:24\_] zations, right? And probably really low. So I mean I'm not suggesting that it's not possible, but it's just -- it's a real number.

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Mm-hm.

MICHAEL KANE: It's three years away, so --

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Right.

MICHAEL KANE: It's almost three years away, right? So --

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Yep. Got a lot of work to do.

JAY KAHN: Has to happen.

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Yep. So do you want me to do the next one or not? I don't know what your agenda's like. I do have a hard stop on --

MICHAEL KANE: We're running short of time --

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Okay, I can --

MICHAEL KANE: -- because we have Rich and then Brian as well.

RICH LAVERS: well, Chris and I were going to --

MICHAEL KANE: Oh, okay, great.

RICH LAVERS: -- but we can --

MICHAEL KANE: Oh, great.

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: We can do that another time.

RICH LAVERS: [Simultaneous speech] We'll basically do that our next meeting.

MICHAEL KANE: No. No, go for it.

RICH LAVERS: It's an easy commute for me today.

MICHAEL KANE: No, go for it. Go for it.

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: All right.

MICHAEL KANE: Joe, we can do that quick?

JOE DOIRON: Yep.

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: So Rich, this is your computer. I don't know what --

RICH LAVERS: I won't break it.

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: So --

RICH LAVERS: Go ahead. I can then talk high-level then you can go into the different --

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Yep.

RICH LAVERS: -- different strategies.

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Figured while we had you guys here...

[Side conversation]

RICH LAVERS: So I was glad that -- Rich Lavers, I work for Commissioner Capadis here at Employment Security. I was glad that he was having everyone here so we could finally show Mike Somers that we're not hiding 30,000 people from the workforce here in the Unemployment Agency.

MIKE SOMERS: I haven't seen the whole building yet, so.

RICH LAVERS: You're going on a tour later on, so



we're going to be able to prove that. So housing barriers with Chris spending some time talking about the work of the housing stability group is one of our barriers that we deal with, right? And we know that in addition to housing, we also have other barriers that prevent people from getting into the workforce, and that's what we do with our WIOA programs, with Employment Security and BEA and Southern New Hampshire services.

And we're trying to provide people that need assistance with education, with training, transportation through our programs, helping them get into the workforce, right? And with our partners at "Beth" with the community college system, doing all that work.

But those barriers don't address all of the issues, right? We have other issues that we refer to as "benefit cliff issues" that prevent a large number of people from ever getting into our workforce.

By benefit cliffs, we're talking about issues with people that don't take on additional hours or don't take on that new job because of a concern or not only a perceived concern, but other experiences that they've seen with friends and family that the additional hours of that

new job actually result in a net loss of resources when you start taking into consideration some of the supports that they were previously receiving, whether that's housing subsidies, SNAP, TANF, Medicaid -- that they actually experience a net loss.

And it's not just a one and done type of cliff that these folks encounter. These are a series of cliffs that families encounter over five to 10 years, until they're actually going to be in a positive place from having taken on that job.

So what we've done through a series of groups that have been tackling this issue since pre-pandemic, we went about bringing in a national group -- an accounting firm out of Philadelphia that looked at the benefit cliff issues from an economic perspective, right?

So we're looking -- we know the micro economic benefits, but from a macro perspective, what are the benefits to the state from expanding our workforce through our existing people who right now are unable to participate because of these benefit cliff.

So we did that analysis. We came up with some great recommendations. Those recommendations have been put

through the ringer with teams that Chris has developed and spearheaded by HHS. And now some of those specific recommendations are on a few slides here that Chris can talk about and kind of what the timeline is and what we're trying to do.

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: And I think how New Hampshire approached this with the economic analysis is we really looked at the -- we didn't look at the whole state, right? So I live in Belknap County. And so what happens in -- you know, Barnstead is very different than Meredith, right?

And so we -- or even if you think about Tilton -- so when we did the economic analysis, we looked at the whole state; we looked at the 10 counties, and then we broke it down into 40 different communities to really look at what is the economic impact for families in those communities.

And what happened is when the pandemic hit, instead of saying, "We're not going to do this," we expanded our research, and really looked at unemployment. Originally, we looked at child care affordability, which is significant as part of the cliff effect, but then we looked

at availability, and different pieces.

And so we did an extensive analysis. And all of that is actually on our website. And you can link to it and you can see community by community.

But what we came up with were different ways to enhance our workforce. Because New Hampshire has very low unemployment, and there's individuals who are untapped resources if they could -- if it was affordable for them to work.

Because no family wants to take on a job or take on more hours and have their family be worse off, right? That's irresponsible. So what are some things that we can do?

So what we looked at is through our work together, we found there's this list called the, "high demand job list." It's through the unemployment security, and there's like 90 jobs. And those are high-demand jobs that really have a good return for somebody. And you have the ability to make a lot of money. So what we said was, so for two years we'll allow you to continue receiving your TANF benefit -- which really helps families meeting the necessities of a young family -- while you're working

towards this demand, job. Because that is going to help our workforce; it's also going to help the family.

We also are working with an automotive dealership, hopefully to really think about a savings program. Because we know lots of people who are living in poverty will buy a really old used car, and that car needs lots of work. And the minute they can't get to work, then they lose their job, right?

So how do we make sure people have really reliable transportation? We know it's not going to be public transportation in all parts of the state. So how can we do a savings program?

We're also going to look to change our TANF disregard. Right now, we allow 50 percent income disregard. We're going to go up to 65% -- again, for people to have more money in their pockets, so they can afford to go to work, as well as expanding education requirements, looking at the long-term, and also, a post TANF support program.

What we find is oftentimes it's not the job that people struggle with, it's all the external things happening in their life, whether it's child care, whether

it's transportation -- other barriers impact somebody's job.

We also are going to look to increase our SNAP gross income limit. Because by doing that enables children and families to be eligible for free and reduced lunch; again, more money in family's' pockets, more ability for people to go back to work. Childcare is a huge barrier for people, whether it's availability or affordability.

And so one of the things we're looking at is are there some creative ways and there are some things happening in different parts of the state where business can support child care? Because what we heard loud and clear during the pandemic was business saying, "We need childcare for our workers to come to work."

And it doesn't necessarily mean having childcare in the business, because that may not be effective, but we worked with a local business in the Lakes Region, and they partnered with a local childcare center so now they're buying slots for some families.

So that they know as new people come in, they've reserved five to 10 slots for children, so they will have childcare. The childcare centers has that as additional

income.

So how are some ways that businesses can be creative? I used to run a non-profit, and for about five to 10 years, we actually did the back office for a local childcare center, because it really helped them bring down their operating expenses, which then in turn goes to wages for employees.

We're also going to look at an increase of eligibility so more families qualify for childcare assistance, which means more families will be able to go to work and afford childcare.

We're going to raise our state payment rates for nontraditional hours. We hear about this a lot. We don't see a lot of it, because it's in isolated situations. But working in communities where they need a lot of second and maybe third shift childcare; how do we make that happen? And a lot of that will be done individually.

We're going to have more -- there's steps we have, which is really confusing, but really to help people maintain more of their money and not pay so much in childcare.

And then we're really going to look at

enrollment-based childcare. That's something that we hear a lot. Because how we pay for the state for people who receive childcare assistance, it's not paid -- you're only paid when your kids attend. So that makes it difficult for childcare centers to take children on our scholarship program.

And then, oh, this we can really -- this is really exciting. Rich gets really excited about this. As part of our work, as we're developing a benefit cliff calculator, so an individual with their case manager -- and it's almost live, it's not live yet, but it's going to be live soon -- can go in and figure out, "If I make [this] amount of money, what will I lose in benefits? Where's the tipping point for me to increase my wages and not lose my benefits?"

And it's going to become a planning tool for workers all across the state and case managers to really help families -- I mean help individuals figure out what's the breaking point? What can I earn and still maintain my benefits?

RICH LAVERS: And this really goes towards that perception problem, right? If you know someone or a family



member that encountered a benefit cliff, just the concern about that, even though you're not in the greatest spot in the world, you're comfortable enough so you're not going to take the rest, not going to take on those additional hours. This helps combat that perception.

So now you can see right in front of your very own eyes with your own data that you've entered through a series of pretty simple questions, you can see, "Okay, where am I going to be if I did take on -- go from part-time to full-time or take on that new job? I think it will have a big impact helping again with that perception.

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: And it also will help employers, because there was actually a local employer in town who is really vested in a lot of this work. And she talked about, "Oh, I have increased my starting wage to X." And she's like, "Oh my gosh, I never thought about what somebody would lose." And so now an employer could even -- you know, model increases to their employees and what it would or would not do.

So this would be live hopefully the end of this month, early next week. And then also what -- we're also partnering with the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta to

expand our cliff calculator to become (sic) policy-level information, so we can understand, you know, as a state what are some of the policy implications, as well as a planner for individuals to know. [If you make [this] amount at [this] point in your life, what do you need to be making later on to develop financial security?]

So I think that's kind of it. So more to come on that. Some questions? And all the information's in your packet, so -- I know you all have a big agenda, so thank you.

JOE DOIRON: Can you share your e-mails with the Board?

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Yep.

RICH LAVERS: If you have questions?

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: Yeah, you can share it, right? Okay.

COLLECTIVE: Thank you.

JAY KAHN: [Jay Kahn] Could you share the site for the Cliff calculator?

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: It should -- yeah, it's not live yet.

JAY KAHN: Okay.

CHRISTINE SANTANIELLO: But I did I think put in somewhere we have a cliff page at the Department. But we can share that as well.

JOE DOIRON: And we're just going to open up -- Bryan Gottlob from New Hampshire Employment Security for a follow-up presentation.

BRAIN GOTTLÖB: Bear with me while I get this PowerPoint up. Don't look at my password.

COLLECTIVE: [Laughter]

BRIAN GOTTLÖB: Okay. So do these folks know what I'm here to talk about?

COMMISSIONER COPADIS: some do.

BRIAN GOTTLÖB: Some do. Yesterday, Commissioner Capadis asked me if I would be able to talk about the implications of removal of federal benefits. So a completely not controversial issue. I'm sure nobody has an opinion on whether there's been an impact.

So I'm going to hopefully shed some light on what I think is happening in New Hampshire, and maybe nationally, but I'm going to focus on what's happening in New Hampshire.

It is a very controversial issue. There are --

almost nobody doesn't have an opinion on it. So everybody either has come to the conclusion that eliminating the federal benefits has had no positive impact on the labor force, increasing labor force participation, or people -- and a lot of business people have said it's one of the reasons why we haven't gotten as many people back in the labor force.

I think the evidence is confounded by a number of issues -- okay. So the interesting thing for me about this is it's a wonderful natural experiment, which you don't get very often in economics.

You know, there's no artificial treatment here. There are states that ended benefits early, there are states that didn't end benefits early; what's the difference? Classic difference in different statistical treatment.

And it sounds like very straightforward, but it's really not that straightforward; one because the big influence is a lot of the analysis that I've seen that has come out very quickly have an ideological bent -- political or an ideological bent.

If you happen to be a big supporter of ending the

benefits, you see the benefits to the labor force the opposite if you didn't support ending those benefits. So I caution people about looking at those kinds of -- those studies.

The bigger issue for me, because now that I'm working for -- doing work for the Bureau of Labor Statistics is if you know anything about them, numbers get revised regularly. And they get revised employment numbers very substantially at the beginning of every year.

This year, the revisions are going to be even greater, because there's been a lot of difficulties with the surveying process; the businesses and individuals. There's two surveys that are done; household survey, surveying individuals, that's what we base the unemployment rate on.

The payroll survey is a survey of businesses. And that's done about a week later. Both of those surveys have suffered from very low return rates, difficult to get people during the pandemic. The numbers have been erratic. They haven't followed traditional seasonal patterns. The numbers are going to be revised.

So we've got studies right now that came out 6

weeks after the ending of federal benefits of some states, and have drawn conclusions. There was not a significant impact on the labor force or the opposite.

I don't believe we'll really know what happened until after all the revisions are done, and after all of the data has been cleaned up. And that's going to take a while. We do have some clues, and I'll talk a little bit about that.

The other issue for New Hampshire, when we look at this data, is that we're not uniquely affected, but certainly in the region, we have over 100,000 people that work in other states -- in states that did not end federal benefits early.

So they had no motivation, necessarily, to get back into the labor force. They're in -- technically in our labor force, but they work in Massachusetts, so they counted in the payroll employment in Massachusetts, or were prior to being laid off or stepping out of the labor force.

So that's really difficult when such a substantial number of people aren't subject to the same treatment, to the same natural experimental treatment.

Other big issue, when you look at who ended

benefits early, who didn't among states, tended to be -- you know, this is the classic interpretation: The red states ended them early, blue states didn't. Well, there's another -- red states, and particularly in the south, tended to have very high levels of COVID during the period immediately following the end of benefits, which obviously impacted the ability of people to go back to work and be employed.

The studies that have been done to date, anyway, that I've seen, haven't factored in that yet. Again, making it difficult to really interpret what has actually been the effect. And I have to say, you know, as somebody who's looked at labor market studies forever, it's generally been accepted that unemployment insurance adds a small percentage to the unemployment rate. Not a bad thing; it's the price we pay for a compassionate program to give people income support when they lose their job.

The ultimate effect of that is is to raise the unemployment rate, as people have a little bit more luxury to look for additional work or find more appropriate work. So it tends to add to the unemployment rate a quarter to a half a percent. Not a bad thing at all.

So to think that adding \$600 or \$300 and making it a number of other available reasons for being unemployed or stepping out of the labor force pandemic related programs, to suggest that that doesn't have some additional impact on the unemployment rate to me kind of goes against what is long-standing economic theory. And I don't want to really get in a lot of theory, but just to make that clear.

And finally -- and I'm going to show you a chart related to this -- there are demographic factors. It is not a one -- it's not a monolithic effect. I think the incentive effects are different for different industries and different age groups.

Mike, your workforce because it's a younger workforce: Those additional federal benefits probably in many cases provided more income to those individuals within -- certainly within their right, and in their -- in their eyes in their best interest to accept that, rather than maybe go back to work. So younger people are more affected. So it's not across the board. I'll talk a little bit about that.

So lastly, it'll just -- it'll be a little while before the real impact. So hold on.



Just to give you an idea of where we are in terms of employment, I only have a total of seven charts, so it won't be that long. This is where we employment wise prior to the pandemic starting in 2018 -- 670 some thousand people employed in New Hampshire. This was my forecast of where we would be. This was prior to pandemic. We were going to add about nine-tenths of a percent, and then 1 percent the following year, 2020-2021. This is what actually happened [laughter] with the pandemic, you know, dropping over 100,000 jobs for a relatively short period of time; a big bounceback.

But then you see kind of it went back down a little bit. What was going on there? One of the things that was going on there was the addition of federal benefits. So you see that it -- you know, if you look at the labor force, you did see some of that. And since that time, we've sort of -- you know, it's been a bit of a mixed bag. We've had some ups and downs.

And I do -- and I make this point all the time within this department -- sometimes too loudly outside of this department, but I think we're underestimating the employment in this state. I think the Bureau of Labor

Statistics is. I think they're undercounting for a number of reasons. So I think that will be revised up.

But still, we're not seeing that progress that we would like to see. Anybody here who's a businessperson understands the labor, the difficulty we had; despite the fact that we have this, which is job openings -- advertised job openings in the state that are higher than they were prior to the pandemic.

There are plenty of job openings, and I mean across the board. Every industry has a number of openings. Everybody here who runs a business or is associated with a business knows. And granted we had labor shortages prior to the pandemic, we had skills gaps, we've got them in spades now. It has exacerbated that situation.

Way too complicated of a chart. I'm going to do my best to explain it. A lot of lines going on there. The red line to the upper left is the total number of individuals claiming unemployment benefits on a weekly basis. That's the regular state programs plus the federal programs -- the PUA and the PEUC program.

And we only here go back to this April, okay? The blue line below it is just the traditional unemployment

insurance program, the state-operated program in order to qualify you have to have been laid off, you have to be looking for work, et cetera.

Not the federal programs, which allowed people to step out of the -- or collect unemployment benefits if they were self-employed, if they had issues related to the pandemic, health concerns, child care -- a number of reasons to qualify for unemployment benefits that did not qualify them in a regular program.

The text up there is some significant policy actions that were taken during the most recent seven months, I think since April of this year. So in April -- I think April 24, the Governor announced the return of work search requirement. Okay. We were starting to trend down.

That probably prompted, because they had to -- you know, certify that they were looking for it -- probably prompted some people to get back into the labor force and accept some work.

Later, in May, the work search took effect May 23 at the same time the Governor announced that federal benefits -- federal unemployment benefits, the PUA, PEUC programs were going to be ending June 19. And same time

announced a back to work stipend of \$1000 for individuals who worked eight consecutive weeks after a period of unemployment. So that was significant.

Again, if you look and see pretty consistent decline even before the federal benefits ended, we saw a decline. Federal benefits, the last week was June 26, I think, for actually filing of eligibility -- nineteenth. Twenty-sixth was the last week that they were paid, probably, right? Okay. That's not my end of the business.

After the federal benefits ended, big drop. And since that time, the blue line, which is our regular unemployment, we're back to pre-pandemic levels. And if you look at initial unemployment claims, the most recent week I think just under 300 -- under 3000 in terms of continued unemployment. Those are pre-pandemic levels.

I think the year before, we had in the -- the year before the pandemic, the lowest we had ever had I think was 2400 in a week. And just -- and somewhere under 300 for initial unemployment. So we're back to pre-pandemic levels.

The yellow line is not seasonally adjusted employment. So as those claims are going down, employment

was going up. It's kind of plateaued a little bit, and it's turning down. I think some of that is measurement error. So 80 percent decline.

So I do think there's been some positive impact from the removal of the federal benefits. But again, we're still affected by over 100,000 individuals who during this time period until early in September were still allowed to collect federal benefits if they're working in Massachusetts, Vermont...

Oops! Keep hitting the wrong button here. This is a really early chart, but it's labor force; how the labor force has changed. And this is actual seasonal adjustment. Too much -- more than you need to know, but the seasonal adjustment process is designed to do one thing. It's designed to smooth out the big ups and downs that happen regularly throughout the year. People come in and out of the labor force.

You know, students come in in the summer, they leave in the fall as they go back to school. Big hiring people enter at Christmastime because they lose lots of jobs. So you get a big -- seasonal adjustment is designed to smooth all of that out. Strictly a statistical process.

But when you look at these, these are seasonally adjusted numbers. And I highlight Massachusetts. There is no way on earth that a labor force is bouncing around like that, unless there's something else going on. What's going on in my view is that the models that are used to do this are messed up. The seasonal adjustment models are messed up.

Another reason why I think we need to wait until we're not doing model-based estimates, but we're actually doing -- every quarter we do a Census of our employers. We get a solid number of people that are working in every state. It's six months lagged.

When those numbers come out, then we have a much better idea of how many people are employed, and that's related to the benchmarking process it's called. When all that shakes out, we'll see different numbers.

And until we have those numbers, we can't really from my perspective even assess what's happening. We have anecdotal evidence. I think it's been beneficial, but we don't have solid evidence.

This is the last chart. When I talk about, you know, I didn't come here -- I didn't really want to come

here to give you opinions, but I have a thesis, or I have a hypothesis. And that is that the impact of the incentive effect of federal benefits has greatly, it greatly differs by age group.

There's a couple things happening on this chart. This shows the difference in labor force participation in the year before the pandemic in the month of August compared to the month of August of this year, so during the pandemic.

A couple of groups have had huge declines in their labor force participation. One is older residents. What you would that be? Well, I tried to get this data for New Hampshire, haven't been able to do it, but nationally, filings for Social Security are at record levels as the percentage of people who are eligible. A lot of people stepped out of the labor force.

In New Hampshire, our older population tends to be wealthier than the national average. So when you think about what's happened over the last couple of years with stock market gains, housing values, people nest eggs have increased substantially, so more people feel more comfortable I believe in stepping out of the labor force.

And I think that's what you see. Because that 60-64 age group, those are people who, you know, normally necessarily wouldn't step out of the labor -- some would, but not in the numbers that we've seen.

And this is a big blow. These are people who -- a lot of them are not likely to come back into the labor force. And for me personally -- you know, when I do forecasts of labor force and employment, it's counting on people working longer -- fewer of the jobs that we have require physical -- you know, abilities.

So it was trending up longer. People were working longer -- not necessarily because they had to, although some did, but largely because they were able to. Work didn't demand a lot of physical [work.]

So those are folks that it's going to be hard to get back. On the other end is people in the 20-24 in particular. Think about the characteristics of those individuals. One, they don't have a lot of responsibilities for the most part. Two, they're employed heavily in industry that -- like, retail hospitality industries where they dominate -- industries that when you're getting a federal benefit of \$600 or \$300 you've got



stimulus payments of \$1200 and \$600, you got the luxury of moving home for a while.

And certainly that's not everybody, but for a 20-24 year old, \$600, \$300 plus whatever you're getting in state unemployment benefits probably got you more. And I did this analysis very early in the pandemic with the \$600. You know, two-thirds of the individuals were making more in unemployment than they were -- in the state were making more than they made employed.

And it was largely because of the industries that people were laid off in heavily, you know, tended to be personal care, retail, a lot of hospitality jobs -- people in close contact, those businesses got shut down.

So they had the luxury of maybe waiting or looking for, you know, the right opportunity to go back into labor. Those are people who I think will come back. We're -- those -- you can't be 20 and 24 years old and stay out of the labor force. Or 25-29; still a demographic group that by and large isn't, you know, married with families. Certainly there are some.

I do not believe that the federal benefits had a substantial impact on -- you know, Main Street -- place in

the middle of their, you know, their careers, their earning lives. You know, if you're married and got kids, you're not stepping out of the labor force because of the federal benefits.

But there are groups, and particularly that young group, which populates -- again industries that are having the hardest time getting people back into work -- and I think that's what's happening. Took longer than I had hoped for, but I'll take questions.

Yes?

JIM PROULX?: We read about record savings, right?

BRIAN GOTTLLOB: Yes.

JIM PROULX: During this, and has there been any correlation between the decrease in the level of savings and return to work, is that, do we start to see savings start to be completed?

Because if you talk about that 20-29-year-old bracket, to your point, low -- would you say, liabilities, the ability to live at home, that kind of thing, right? Eventually they'll run out of money in theory, right? As they buy down that savings, or spend down that savings.

BRIAN GOTTLÖB: Yep.

JIM PROULX: Is there any correlation?

BRIAN GOTTLÖB:

Yeah. The savings rate data that I have doesn't have it broken down by age.

JIM PROULX: But has it started to -- has that level started to drop?

BRIAN GOTTLÖB: It hasn't yet, really.

JIM PROULX: It hasn't started to drop yet?

BRIAN GOTTLÖB: No, it really hasn't. You know, savings rates are still at record levels, which is -- you know, in some ways a really good thing. You know, a lot of concern about the economy. People are for the most part are flush.

JIM PROULX: But they tied that to the incentive programs, right?

BRIAN GOTTLÖB: Right. Yeah. It did. But it was -- the incentive program had some impact. I mean, look, we had a quarter during the pandemic of high unemployment rates where personal income grew more -- grew at a record rate. Why was that? Because of what -- transfer payments.

What's a transfer payment? Well, it's things like Social Security, but it's also unemployment benefits. And it's all the stimulus.

JIM PROULX: Stimulus.

BRIAN GOTTLÖB: So early this year, the first quarter of this year, we had record high personal income growth quarter over quarter, despite how many people were unemployed. And it was because of transfer payments.

So people -- there was more done to keep income levels up, keep income support going during this pandemic, this recession, than has ever been done. And, you know, people still have -- I mean, one they couldn't spend as much -- one, and it's hard to spend things now! You know, it's hard to -- try to buy a refrigerator. I've tried. It's not easy. You can't do it.

JOE DOIRN: Brian, I think we have time for one more question.

BRIAN GOTTLÖB: Yeah.

DAVID CIOFFI: If Dr. Fauci got up tomorrow and said, "The pandemic is over, go back to work," would it have an impact?

BRIAN GOTTLÖB: You know, I think it's -- people

-- if I've learned anything, it's that people's personal sense of safety and their willingness -- you know, you can open up restaurants, but if they don't feel comfortable going to restaurants, they're not going to go into a restaurant.

So I'm not sure that -- how much of an impact that would have. I think people who haven't been worried about it have been here doing whatever they do typically. So I'm not sure how much of an impact this would have.

When it does end, and everybody feels comfortable, it will be positive. Look, my personal belief is our economy is at a much stronger basis right now than most people think. You know, we've got some things that are negative, but there's a lot of good things. Other than -- I mean, supply chain issues are important, but we're at a much stronger basis than a lot of people think.

All right. Sorry I took so long, Joe.

JOE DOIRON: Thank you, Brian. Thank you.

MICHAEL KANE: Thanks, Brian.

JOE DOIRON: That brings us to item 2b, which can be counted on found on page 114 of your packet.

MICHAEL KANE: So I'd like to introduce Laura

LeCain.

LAURA LECAIN: Hi, everyone, I'm Laura LeCain. I'm the Administrator for the Office of Workforce Opportunity. I kind of gave a high-level update on the first page, page 115. However, there's three charts that follow that, that go over each program year's grant.

As of June 30, so the end of the program -- the program around July 1 through June 30.

I'll give you a minute to take a peek and then let me know if you do have any questions.

[Pause]

LAURA LECAIN: Does anyone have any questions about any of the charts or any of the financial sections?

[Pause]

MICHAEL KANE: I will introduce Jim Hinson.

JIM HINSON: Hi. I'm Jim Hinson, with the Office of Workforce Opportunity. I'm the Rapid Response Coordinator. One of the good things is as we've transitioned into this near year the official reporting year July 1 through June 30, and we've only documented four Rapid Responses so far this year, which is a significant drop from last year at this time; we had nine.

And so far, we're only looking at 218 workers being impacted. The industries that were hit were health care, manufacturing and education kind of spread across New Hampshire. It really wasn't focused in on one area.

The good news about that is with the hiring needs, we had tremendous number of people and businesses reaching out to us looking to do everything they could to get existing employees to continue to work. So that was a very positive thing. So I think it's a good trend right now that we're seeing fewer Rapid Responses going into this year.

Moving forward, we are offering in-person Rapid Responses, but also taking into consideration how people feel and the comfort level of the businesses. We offer a video for small numbers of layoffs, or people who can't get to a Rapid Response. But we also offer Zoom teleconferencing Rapid Responses as well.

You know, based on what we said last time, we are going to continue to reach out to any layoff notice, whether it's one or over the required 25; at which we have that, just because there's just too many needs -- people to, there's too many people looking for workers.

The one big difference we were able to do, we did provide staff training to Business and Economic Affairs facilitators. We covered the new standard operating procedure. We made sure that they had all the documentations that they needed and kind of gave them a refresher on how to do a Rapid Response in person and on Zoom.

So at this point, we're doing very well. Any questions on what we have going on this year?

[Pause]

If not, I'll just keep moving forward. The end of the year report also came up. Since then on July 30, I did up an end-of-the-year report. Overall, we had 25 Rapid Response activities of all of the last reporting year that impacted 1168 employees.

Due to the COVID restrictions, it wasn't until June 1 of this year that we actually started offering in-person again. But the in-person Rapid Responses have been going very well. And we continue to offer Zoom conferencing.

The one big difference I would say moving forward in addition to the training that we provided to the



facilitators, we will be doing Rapid Response Team practices online via Zoom. And this -- at the end of October, in the beginning of November most of the Rapid Responses that come in during the year usually hit us in November, December, January and February.

So we're trying to gear up and make sure that we have teams ready, ready to go and being able to get as many options as we can. And that concludes my report.

MICHAEL KANE: Thank you very much. LISA GERRARD?

LISA GERRARD: Hi. I'm LISA GERRARD. I'm the Program Administrator for Office of Workforce Opportunity. The program performance updates, that's on page 122 in your packet. And continues to about 147. I did a PY 20-2044?] update. So our programs are youth programs that then exceeded all of their performance measures, our Adult Dislocated Worker and our National Dislocated Worker grants met or exceeded all but one in each program area four quarter 4.

When we look at the program year as a whole, all of our programs in our Adult Dislocated Worker and Youth programs met or exceeded all the performance measures.

That's the year of COVID.

So I would highly -- sorry, lost my train of thought -- so they actually did a really great job with all the areas that they had. And they all met or exceeded those measures.

For Adult, we had 256 participants, 160 of those participants received training services. In our Dislocated Worker program, we had 108 participants for the program year, and 78 of them received training services.

And in Youth, we had 271 participants, with 104 of them receiving training services. So, again, they really hold up PY 20 with some really great numbers, and some really good performance.

Here are some charts that are after the year end -- year end reports that kind of break down each program in demographics. And then I included -- each program provided a year-end summary or a year-end report to the office. And I included those as well for your review.

Does anyone have any questions about performance measure?

MICHAEL KANE: So if you were really -- it's a 4, a 2f program success story.

LISA GERRARD: Yeah. So the next item agenda is actually the 2e, which is the --

MICHAEL KANE: Oh, sorry.

LISA GERRARD: -- that's okay. It's the annual monitoring summary report. So Board member Kelly Clark came over and reviewed the monitoring binders. There are quite a few more monitoring activities this year, because WIOA Youth came over to the office, so we had quite a lot more for Kelly to review. But in general, all the reviews were clients (sic). There were no findings, and any findings or issues were taken care of.

We also gave Kelly the PY21 monitoring schedule, and both Kelly and Jim Kane (phonetic) signed off on the monitoring report and the monitoring schedule. But I'd be happy to answer any questions if anyone has any, or Kelly would like to add anything?

DAVID CIOFFI: I had a question about the out of school youth. You noted that you couldn't fill the program because there were many of the young kids who were getting the extra benefits, then they were made ineligible for the programs. Has that now receded, and are you getting more applicants, or do you expect to?

LISA GERRARD: So enrollments currently are trending where they should be. Enrollments in all the programs last year, it wasn't just the youth programs, it was across the board Adult Dislocated Worker, they were all down enrollment wise. And I don't -- I mean, I'm imagining the issue is COVID and benefits and the not having to job search and things like that. But enrollments currently are all trending where they should be.

So I'll move on to the agenda item 2f, which is program success stories. We tried to include program success stories from all of the different programs, both Adult Dislocated Worker, as well as all the different youth sites. I'm not sure that I can answer any questions about them in general, but if that's the case, I'd be more than happy to help.

MICHAEL KANE: We're going to take a break from you, Lisa, for just a few seconds.

LISA GERRARD: That's totally fine.

MICHAEL KANE: Joe?

JOE DOIRON: Mr. Chairman, again, for the record Joe Doiron. The Review Subcommittee met on October 27, and this is on page 165 of the Board Packet to discuss the

Outdoor Recreation, our few responses, and review the information from Department of Health and Human Services' Condition of Economic and Housing Stability, Bureau of Employment or SNAP Employment and Training State Plan. That's a very long sentence.

So we were still working through the Outdoor Rec part p (sic) at the time of the report. We had multiple responses. The SNAP Employment and Training State Plan was reviewed, and the Review Subcommittee Supports, or the Bureau of Employment Supports were partnered within our efforts to have coordination with the State Workforce Innovation Board. So Review Committee did that.

And further, the Review Committee recommends inviting Staff from the Bureau of Employment Supports - Kim Runion (phonetic) is here, hi Kim -- 1:20:07 to discuss their efforts. But I didn't know if Dave or Kelly wanted to chime in on anything I might have neglected or overlooked.

DAVID CIOFFI: Great, thank you.

JOE DOIRON: I'm happy to take any questions, Mr. Chair.

JAY KAHN: Mr. Chairman, [Jay Kahn], what is the

Outdoor Recreation RFP?

JOE DOIRON: So the State Workforce Innovation Board's released an RFP for qualified contractors to look at outdoor recreation as talent and attraction retention. So we released that. And we released it, but with a new program that we're going to talk about, the VIP program and the potential to also receive other non WIOA federal funds that are coming our way into the Workforce Office. We're going to hold off on issuing that RFP, due to staff time and efforts and rerelease that same RFP in January, February is the hope and goal.

So the RFP is on the nhworks website and was released -- I'm trying to remember; it was a topic of conversation the June 8 meeting. So sometimes it's past summer or fall -- early fall. I can't remember dates off the top of my head.

JAY KAHN: It's a Workforce Development Plan?

MICHAEL KANE: So we're looking at leveraging outdoor recreation resources here in the state to be a talent attraction and retention mechanism so we're not losing --

JAY KAHN: Customers.

JOE DOIRON: -- try --

JAY KAHN: Yeah. So it would be kind of like a rising tide [1:21:42 indiscernible all ships] sort of deal. And we're looking forward to rereleasing that, but with the VIP and a few other efforts. It just -- you know, we're a small team, and we're --

David Cioffi: Jay, if you look at the last -- the last meeting we had, there was a presentation made by a couple of people who knew a lot about the industries, to show what the needs were, and what they would be able to do with money. And if you get a chance to look through it, it's quite interesting.

JAY KAHN: All right.

JULIE DEMERS: Julie Demers for the record. So did -- the RFP was released -- were there submissions?

JOE DOIRON: Yep.

JULIE DEMERS: It's being rereleased?

JOE DOIRON: Yep. So we're going to let the Board -- now, we're exercising I think Section 7.f if memory serves correct, and that we're going to rerelease the funding, update some priorities, because we're also potentially seeing some federal funds come in.

JULIE DEMERS: Right, Mm-hm.

JOE DOIRON: That could be utilized instead of WIOA dollars.

JULIE DEMERS: Yeah.

JOE DOIRON: That's why we're kind of put into a little bit of a spot. So we would rerelease, but we did have multiple responses -- both past technical review and both were both competitive prospects. So we hope to see those two folks respond again and perhaps even more.

JULIE DEMERS: Great.

JOE DOIRON: So we did have an accelerated time line, because we saw some projects come.

JULIE DEMERS: Yeah.

JOE DOIRON: But it's just -- there's a lot of federal dollars out there.

JULIE DEMERS: Okay. Just wanted to make sure I understood. Thank you.

MICHAEL KANE: Are we good to move on? Back to you Lisa.

LISA GERRARD: LISA GERRARD, for the record. So on page 166 is the closeout for the National Health Emergency Grant, which was our Dislocated Worker



Demonstration Grant -- Minority Grant. It ran from July 21, 2018 and ended June 13, 2021.

We had a total of 15 participants. They reached 79 percent of their total. They had a goal of 400 individuals. There were a total of 20 trainings funded directly through the grant, and we did some individual trainings and on-the-job trainings with that. There was money left at the end of the grant, so that was returned, because the grant ended. Is there any questions about that?

MAYOR LOVETT: [Charlene Lovett] so what contributed to the role of the [\_01:24:34\_indiscernible] enrollment? Because I'm assuming that's why so much money wasn't spent?

LISA GERRARD: It was directly related to COVID. When COVID hit, the recovery centers closed their doors to -- so they really struggled with enrollment during COVID. It's also a very high population. So that also kind of came into it.

They found -- Southern New Hampshire services found that the biggest stumbling block I guess you would say was with documentation.

So with individuals actually being able to get their documentation that's needed [-- to copies of birth certificates, Social Security cards, things like that. People in recovery or people trying to be in recovery, there's a lot going on. And that was just seen to be the stumbling block. Any other questions? Thanks for your time.

MICHAEL KANE: All right. Don't go away.

LISA GERRARD: Okay.

MICHAEL KANE: We -- [audio unclear] Joe --

JOE DOIRON: Again, for the record, Joe Doiron. The nhworks website and the NH Department of Administrative Services has a current -- RFP out of our office revealed funds with the Vibrant, Inclusive and Prosperous program utilizing adult WIOA funds of \$1.2 million over a 30-month-period of performance, and we're targeting January 1, 2022 and ending through June 30,2024. As I mentioned, we had the RFP released. But its goal of the RFP is to engage with historically marginalized populations and those who had been systemically excluded.

And we had some lists in there, including communities of color, new Americans, immigrants, refugees,

caregivers to children, the disabled, older adults, women, the LGBT+ community, homeless individuals, single parents and veterans. And the idea is outreach and engagement to try to get them into our adult services, and that there's eligibility requirements, but it's 18+ for that. And Lisa, did I miss anything? I think I did.

LISA GERRARD: No, I think you got everything. So we're looking -- the RFP is for -- to partner with some agencies that can do referrals and outreach, so that they can then kind of bring that pipeline into the adult program.

So it's really working with, or trying to get agencies within those marginalized communities and doing the outreach and the groundwork to get participants, but also to help with the documentation and try to get that all set up, before we get them into (sic) the case manager and community advocates.

JOE DOIRON: And we understand the need for more folks to move into the state. But I think it's also important to have them fully engaged with all of New Hampshire citizens as well. So this is -- we're trying to attack the workforce problem from multiple different ways,

to engage different populations and so on. So we're trying to take feedback that we've heard from out in the field and implement it as fast as we can.

MICHAEL KANE: All right. Back to Lisa for the combined State Plan revisions 2j. Back to you.

LISA GERRARD: Sure. Again, LISA GERRARD for the record. So Combined State Plans was almost just issued, it seems like. But we already have to do revisions, based on WIOA Step 2. So with that in mind, we have created or come up we a plan where we would hold public comment sessions. The list is on page 168.

We'll be holding those in conjunction with the New Hampshire Work Partners, and basically opening it up for public comment so that we can take those comments, and then do the revisions that need to happen on the Combined State Plan. Those revisions are due to USDOL by April 1 of 2022.

So we're trying to get a head start and get things in the pipeline early, so that we can have as much time as we need to actually do the revisions in the writing.

MICHAEL KANE: Does anyone have any questions for

Lisa?

JOE DOIRON: Item 3a is Approval of SWIB Meeting Calendar. The current bylaws require three meetings a year and as scheduled, the meetings have been developed annually. So we've put together some draft times below with the requested action and a draft motion. And of course the locations can be determined once we ask Mr. Capadis to have us again here. They've been very generous to offer the space to us here today.

COMMISSIONER CAPADIS: I'll have to think about it.

JOE DOIRON: So everybody behave while you're still here. So we have a draft motion at the bottom, Mr. Chair. It's for consideration for --. So. Should I read the memo and --

JOE DOIRON: I think ask just if there was a motion on the floor?

MICHAEL KANE: Oh, right. Would anyone like to make a motion?

JAY KAHN: Move approve.

TIM SINK: Second.

MICHAEL KANE: All in favor?

COLLECTIVE: Aye.

JOE DOIRON: And just for the record it was Senator Kahn, who made the motion and seconded by Tim Sink. Item, 3b, Mr. Chairman, is continuation of a conversation that we've started in February. It seems like it's not so long ago but yesterday.

At the June 8 meeting -- I should back up -- the Bylaws Committee met -- Subcommittee met on May 10 at 2:00 p.m. The Bylaws Committee was Julie Demers, Jonathan Melanson and who is the third person? I'm kind of drawing a blank.

COLLECTIVE: Kelly Clark ?

JOE DOIRON: Oh, thank you. Right? And there was drafting of the bylaws. We then sent it to US DOL and New Hampshire Department of Justice to ensure compliance and ensure that we weren't doing anything wrong. They both gave their signoff.

The proposed bylaws were presented at the June 8 State Workforce Innovation Board meeting, but could not be voted upon at that meeting per the existing bylaws. Staff has not received any suggestions or feedback following the bylaws being proposed. This would be on June 8.

The first few pages of the packet, you'll see labeled, "State Workforce Opportunity Bylaws." they'll say page 1 through 4 -- those are current existing bylaws. And then on page 176 shows the proposed bylaws as June 8. Mr. Chairman, we're happy to entertain a motion or discussion or however you see fit this evening.

MICHAEL KANE: Would anyone like to make a motion?

PARTICIPANT: So move.

PARTICIPANT: Second.

MICHAEL KANE: [Indiscernible]

JOE DOIRON: And who made the motion? I'm sorry.

MICHAEL KANE: Representative Hatch

JOE DOIRON: And seconded by?

MICHAEL KANE: Dwight Davis. All in favor?

COLLECTIVE: Aye.

MICHAEL KANE: Laura, back to you. Laura LeCain.

LAURA LECAIN: Laura LeCain for the record. So on page 181 is the start of a description of PY 21's annual funding for WIOA Title I. Again, it's Adult Youth and Dislocated Worker. This is for the budget right now that you can see a chart of the -- right after page 186 is the

chart itself.

But 180 to 186 describes the breakdown and some of the reasoning. So the aggregate funding that we were awarded for this program here, for those three parts of WIOA Title I is \$8,490,758. That is of course is broken amongst -- we're informed how, what the breakdown is, what Youth and Dislocated Worker are.

Again, we have to -- we're required to hold at least 10 percent aside for Discretionary Funding, 5 percent for our Admin, and with the exception of Dislocated Worker, at least 85 percent has to go out to the programs. Dislocated Worker you do hold -- in this case this year 10 percent more Rapid Response.

So I'm going to let you take a look at that for a moment, and let me know if you have any questions about it.

[Pause]

LAURA LECAIN: Does anyone have any questions?

MICHAEL KANE: Oh, sorry.

JAY KAHN: [Jay Kahn.] Does this represent any change in funding over the last year? Overall, the \$8 million?

LAURA LECAIN: Sorry, just for clarification,



Senator, when you say a "change in funding" do you mean just compared to prior?

JAY KAHN: It seems higher.

LAURA LECAIN: Yes. You are correct. So normally New Hampshire is a minimum funded state, where we get the minimum that goes out to other states. However, because of the unemployment rate and the impacts of COVID, we did receive more. If you look back at last program year, we believe we received \$6.1 million in the aggregate. So this is quite an increase.

But again, this is a formula funded program. So assuming the unemployment rate has gone down, I wouldn't expect to see this again next program year.

JAY KAHN: It's good news. I don't know the obligations that come with additional \$2 billion dollars funding; more programs? Bigger programs? But it is just a -- the one, it sounds like a one-time opportunity to invest maybe in outdoor recreation opportunities. I don't know. Your guidance on that I think would be valuable.

JOE DOIRON: And I think we're certainly be very conservative with the funding we're trying to -- extending ourselves. I mean, I think if you look at the budget

you'll see, like, some excess funds here and there, but we don't want to overcommit ourselves with -- like, for instance, WIOA Youth for example, we're being very careful, because we don't want to build programs and create new sites just to close them two or three years down the line.

So I think we're taking a very careful and conservative approach, and hopefully we can come to the Board sooner rather than later with additional funding initiatives, with that [1:37:19 carried forward] that we have. But we want to be very careful. Just it's a very fluid situation.

LAURA LECAIN: And I think that the VIP program is a good example of the way in which we can enhance the program while maintaining something that's sustainable.

MICHAEL KANE: Do you have any more questions?

MIKE SOMERS: I'll make a motion to approve the budget as presented.

KELLY CLARK: Second.

JOE DOIRON: Motion by Mike Somers and seconded by Kelly Clark.

KELLY CLARK: Sorry.

JOE DOIRON: All in favor?

COLLECTIVE: Aye.

JOE DOIRON: Okay.

MICHAEL KANE: Well, we're always -- we're going back to LISA GERRARD one more time.

COLLECTIVE: [Laughter]

LISA GERRARD: LISA GERRARD for the record again. So item -- agenda item 3d is WIOA Youth Incentive Policy. Under 20c of our 681(40), there is the ability for WIOA Youth programs to create or give out incentives. And that's payments to youth participants for recognition and achievement directly tied to training activity for work experience.

There has been -- we have not had this policy before. Many states do have it. Oklahoma, Idaho, Missouri do have just to name a few. WIOA Youth has left it up to the states to decide whether or not, one, to create a policy and, two, what that policy kind of gives for incentives.

So in looking at our WIOA Youth program, we thought -- we did a survey to WIOA Case Managers to see if they felt that this policy might help with enrollment or having the kids or the youth complete training and get

work-based learning. And we had a unanimous response that yes, it would.

So we kind of drafted. What we did was draft a policy along with requirements -- you, documentation in a form and things that we agreed to be put in place, where basically we're looking at taking some of the youth money, which brings back to Representative's Kahn's point of extra money, as something that we can see in the future as well.

So I would be more than happy to answer any questions about the policy draft for what it would entail or anything. Basically we have certain incentives that they would attain. And they're listed out for you. And we basically capped it at \$25 per attainment or incentive. We have capped as well what they can earn each year.

So yeah. Let me take any questions, I guess.

KELLY CLARK: Just more of an observation than a comment. It might be, like, a year out an opportunity to come back and share with us the results, given that we've not done this before?

LISA GERRARD: Yes. Absolutely. We are always looking at ways to collect data on anything that is new or something that we create, so that we can have -- whether or

not it's working, basically. So we would -- if this is approved by the Board, we would put it in motion. It wouldn't be a full year this year.

So we might come back and give you some information after we institute it if it's approved. But then we would really want to look at full program -- add to the full program again.

MICHAEL KANE: And for the record, the question was asked by Kelly Clark. Thank you very much for this - if this is constructive collaboration anyone's receptive to: we can get these back to you faster we if don't have to go back and fill in names -- if folks can provide them when they talk -- plus the transcript will read better. Thank you either way!]

JOE DOIRON: It helps with the transcription service -- [\_01:41:13\_ Yes, thank you Joe!]

KELLY CLARK: Yeah, I know.

JOE DOIRON: -- it saves us a little cash.

KELLY CLARK: I wasn't thinking about that.

JOE DOIRON: We're trying to be frugal.

MICHAEL KANE: Any questions for Lisa? So a motion --

DAVID CIOFFI: I so move.

KELLY CLARK: Second by Kelly Clark.

DAVID CIOFFI: Motion -- Dave Cioffi.

MICHAEL KANE: All in favor:

COLLECTIVE: Aye.

MICHAEL KANE: 3e.

JOE DOIRON: When we get into -- 3e was brought up from the conversation last time, and we're trying to get to more high-level discussions with the Board. We talked about -- and the topic was brought up by Mike Somers at the June 8 meeting, relative to the workforce shortage.

And then part of that was to circle back to this meeting and talk about a larger goal with the SWIB, you know, to talk about maybe some strategic direction with the State of New Hampshire for workforce assistance, and some ideas. So we all -- and this kind of dovetails into 3f; topics with the February 1 meeting that we the Staff can either bring in experts and panels or some sort of facilitated conversation to talk about these issues so we can come up with strategies to tackle the workforce issues of the state.

So 3e and 3f don't have any suggested motions,

and it's actually, then it kind of goes into discussion.  
So I'd just like to open it up with that thought.

KELLY CLARK: Given that the outdoor recreational  
[\_01:43:11\_ indiscernible -- is something new, and is --  
program that might be a topic for Lisa or Rich]

MAYOR LOVETT: [Charlene Lovett] Referring back to  
the discussion that Mike Somers led us on at our last  
meeting, I'm kind of curious what the status is of visas --  
which should be J1 visas, or how -- has there been any  
movement to improve that process as far as --

MIKE SOMERS: So -- Mike Somers -- so to the best  
of my knowledge, H-2B and J1 visas, the programs are open,  
they are running. But frankly, they're not really --  
hasn't been a lot of movement on them, honestly. One thing  
we have advocated for with our Congressional delegation is  
for the President to bring back what was considered  
Returning Worker Exemption, which I think I mentioned last  
time.

There's been no movement on that -- again, where  
he's focused on the policy discussion we're having right  
now, but there were H-2B and J1 visa applicants in the, or  
visaholders in the state of New Hampshire working this

summer, but they were far below what historic so it helped, but frankly it wasn't really enough for what we really needed, state of affairs so.

MAYOR LOVETT: So I don't know what role this Board would like, but the visa issue is not just focused on the hospitality industry. There are other industries that are being impacted by not being able to --

[\_01:45:07\_indiscernible and workers that require maintenance in this country. So I don't know if there's a role the Board can play in trying to advocate for some of those issues to be straightened out; especially in this state, as we want to create --]

JIM PROULX: Oh, [Jim Proulx] to your point, maybe a presentation; education rather trying to educate the Board would be a good step at the next meeting? To have that presentation on the process, and how different companies or industry to your point can take advantage or at least understand the groundwork and how you even start.

And then we can maybe go from there and spread that educational component of how it's done. Because everybody's struggling with the same thing. Okay.

JAY KAHN: Thank you. I think that's a great



opportunity to try to build things around a few meetings. So one that I wonder about is our construction trades -- the workforce there. Should there be an infrastructure investment? I hope that there is.

I think our -- we are understaffed to absorb a great influx of infrastructure dollars, and I'd be interested in how some people who are closer to that see the ladder of opportunity growing to meet the demand.

The other place that I think is interesting to see if there's a state role that is the diversity, equity and inclusion initiatives that companies like Fidelity and others have announced that it seemed like they're very internal in their focus.

Is there something that they might see as an overarching, unifying theme across the state that might be valuable for their efforts?

MICHAEL KANE: Yes?

DAVID CIOFFI: I think it would be great to get a report from community colleagues with regards to how things are going with enrollments; where do they see strong enrollments, where would they like to see stronger enrollments, that sort of thing? Find out what's going on

at that level with training.

MIKE SOMERS?: David, maybe we could include that -- how they feel we could leverage the technology to get more people access to community college -- sorry.

TIM SINK: [Tim Sink] I don't know if this is appropriate but a better understanding of how supply-chain issues are affecting employment, but the overlaps might be -- it seems like it's a problem we're going to be having for not just the next six months or a year, but this is a multiyear problem.

BETH DOIRON: Joe?

JOE DOIRON: Yes.

BETH DOIRON: Just wondered if [Beth Doiron from the community college system] if you wanted me to just respond to your question just real briefly? As far -- I mean, we can certainly do a report at the next meeting, but enrollments are -- you know, a little bit below what they were pre-pandemic still. But that's obviously nationally - - the same thing has happened nationally.

Our biggest programs I think we're seeing -- in things like Advanced Manufacturing and Allied Health, those programs are still very strong. But, again, not where they

were pre-pandemic, so certainly not potentially able to fill the need as it is now.

But happy to provide some -- we're focusing a great deal on our noncredit side of the house. We have a new Chancellor, I believe, as you all may know. Dr. Mark Rubinstein, who comes from Granite State College and was heavily into Workforce Development there. So that is a priority for him.

So how can we potentially market our shorter term, noncredit programming as well as we do our credit bureau enforcers. So that will be a big push for us to try to meet the workforce demands as well.

TIM SINK: Do the community colleges teach nursing as part of their --

BETH DOIRON: Every community college has a nursing --

TIM SINK: A nursing --

BETH DOIRON: -- Associate's Degree.

TIM SINK: Is -- Senator, is there -- it's a four-year requirement to become a nurse right now is my understanding, correct?

BETH DOIRON: Still two.

PARTICIPANT: No. Depends on the level.

PARTICIPANT: There's a whole -- a whole ladder,  
but nursing credentials --

PARTICIPANT: Yeah.

PARTICIPANT: -- you get with an LPN and --  
Licensed Practical Nurse, and then --

PARTICIPANT: There's a nursing crisis in New  
Hampshire right now.

PARTICIPANT: Yep.

PARTICIPANT: Hospitals cannot hire nurses.

PARTICIPANT: Yep.

PARTICIPANT: And some of the -- I guess maybe the  
more specialized nursing takes four years to get a degree.  
And maybe we should at least have a look at if we could  
truncate that on a state level.

BETH DOIRON: We --

PARTICIPANT: To try and --

BETH DOIRON: The Legislature actually helped us  
out with the development of -- [Beth Doiron from the  
Community colleges again, sorry] -- helped us  
out with the development of our LPN program. We up until  
two years ago, the year before the pandemic, we did not

have LPN programs. We did years ago, and then the need sort of fizzled.

So we ended -- there was sunset of those programs, but recently within the last few years, we've heard from -- especially the long-term care facilities and the huge need for LPN. So we did start an LPN program in River Valley community college first. It's since moved to Lakes Region. They start in January for whatever reason.

PARTICIPANT: Okay.

BETH DOIRON: Okay. Lakes Region started last week. Both programs only have 10 -- allow for 10 people, but they're full. And I believe River Valley is starting a second cohort of 10 in January. And White Mountains will also be starting in January. So that's a one-year program.

PARTICIPANT: Mm-hm.

BETH DOIRON: And then our two-year, our end programs are the RN Associate degree programs, and then there's the four-year Bachelor BSN program as well, which is not necessarily a step above, but it's for management --

PARTICIPANT: Mm-hm.

BETH DOIRON: -- for nursing. But we also have a number of apprenticeship programs that we're working on in

LNA specifically, as well as medical assistance, and MNAs -  
- a number of different Allied Health programs.

And we're hoping down the line to do some sort of  
LNA to LPN to RN apprenticeship where it'll just be a  
smooth transition through all of those three careers  
through an apprenticeship program so they're working while  
they're learning.

MICHAEL KANE: I mean, I think it would be a good  
idea to have as far as the community college report --

BETH DOIRON: -- sure.

MICHAEL KANE: And if there's way that we can  
expedite getting nurses into the system. Because, you  
know, I sat down with the CEO of Portsmouth Hospital, and  
he was telling me that they're paying Visiting Nurses now  
\$200 an hour and they can't get them.

BETH DOIRON: Right.

MICHAEL KANE: \$200 an hour. That's insane.

BETH DOIRON: So [Beth Doiron again] We typically  
-- pre -- well, I'm speaking pre-pandemic, but pre-pandemic  
many of our nursing programs, especially in the city  
colleges like Manchester, Nashua, Concord, would have 200  
to 300 people apply for I think we have 40 to 60 seats per

college. So those numbers have declined as well.

The number of people applying now are far lower than what we had pre-pandemic. So hopefully that will turn, and we'll see more people coming back in.

But it's -- we can't meet the demand with just what we have -- with the numbered slots.

MICHAEL KANE: Is there a way to expand the number of seats?

BETH DOIRON: That requires an awful lot of -- you know, additional clinical sites that need to come on board. So that would be an effort I think with the Legislature would be to look at something like that.

DAVID CIOFFI: You know, Mike, one of the -- [David Cioffi] -- one of the things I read in here is that the vaccine mandates in a lot of places are causing nurses to resign. And if we get through this pandemic -- of course Dr. Fauci if you could end it -- a lot of -- I think you're going to see these things filling in again.

But I see it in the Upper Valley at the HMC. We've had protests there where you drive in -- you know, over a week telling people, "Forget (sic) to get vaccinated" and then you got protests on the other side

saying, you know, "We support the nurses, you need to get vaccinated." That sort of thing.

But these vaccine mandates are affecting the health care. And on the way up I listened to the radio station, and they were saying that emergency workers in Maine are resigning as a result of vaccine mandates. So there you go. Just -- we have no control over that. Thank you.

PARTICIPANT: It's large.

DAVID CIOFFI: Yeah.

GEORGE COPADIS: I think, you know, here in the health care field --

DAVID CIOFFI: Right?

GEORGE COPADIS: -- you're dealing with -- involved with -- there are other vaccines that are --

DAVID CIOFFI: Yeah.

GEORGE COPADIS: [\_01:54:59\_audio unclear plus crosstalk] -- see how it could be any different, like I said -- and there's a whole now health care field -- eligible more -- if they decide --

DAVID CIOFFI: Is that right? /it's their right.]  
So.



JIM PROULX: Beth? [Jim Proulx]

BETH DOIRON: That's -- sorry --

JIM PROULX: What kind of financial benefits are available for the programs if you have other tuition benefits for students that want to get into these deep programs?

BETH DOIRON: Well, we have programs which are for -- you have a certain income level. And then we also have the community college foundation, which consists with scholarships as well. So --

JIM PROULX: So for a two-year student where it would cost them to complete the program --

BETH DOIRON: It's about \$6000 a year.

JIM PROULX: Per year?

BETH DOIRON: -- for -- I mean, the nursing might be a little bit more expensive, but pretty much it's -- you know, an average of \$6 grand a year.

JIM PROULX: right.

BETH DOIRON: But -- and then there's the WIOA funding and Work Now and all of that can come into play as well to assist with scholarship money and -- well, not scholarship but funding for training.

JIM PROULX: Right.

DWIGHT DAVIS: You know, David, you were talking about the shortage of health care workers; that shortage was there long before COVID.

BETH DOIRON: Right.

DWIGHT DAVIS: COVID has exacerbated it.

DAVID CIOFFI: Mm-hm.

DWIGHT DAVIS: But it was there long before. And because of the [\_01:56:12\_indiscernible grain] of our state in America, it was projected we were -- you go back 15 months, two years ago, we were about a million and a half short of health care workers then. That's prior to COVID. So it's made it much worse.

As far as funding, we do some private funding ourselves. If we can locate a person with a private (sic) work ethic, we can scholarship with our LNAs working hand in hand with this and Great -- Manchester Community College, a really, really good partnership with us.

Matter of fact, you talk about buying cars, that was music to my ears, because we've had to buy a half dozen cars ourselves for people who wanted to work, but they just needed a car.

JIM PROULX: Mm-hm.

DWIGHT DAVIS: So we've been doing some extraordinary things in health care, so it goes all the way down to LNAs and companion caregivers who need help. I was happy to hear about the -- Tanner's program --, with the -- just because of the adjustments that are being made that will help us a lot. We have people who can only work 15 and 20 hours a week, because they're afraid they might lose their benefits. And it's understandable.

MICHAEL KANE: Will we give off February 1? Anything else? Yes? Sorry.

JAY KAHN: Thank you, Chairman. No, I think Mr. Proulx's -- [Jay Kahn, sorry] -- Mr. Proulx's question about what does it cost to attend community college? And it may cost nothing.

And not because they've discounted the rate to 0, it's because federal -- between federal financial aid, Governor Scholarship Funds, other scholarship funds that exist that either the state or the community college does through philanthropy is raised, it's very possible that a needy student doesn't need to pay a tuition rate, which I believe is closer to the \$7500 number and \$215 per hour.

But it -- that's the what I guess I'd like you to think about; that if people want to attend and start on a career track, there are opportunities for them to do that in this state without incurring debt.

MICHAEL KANE: Well, Beth, soon as we start telling them they're going to get two hundred bucks an hour

COLLECTIVE: [Laughter].

PARTICIPANT: Return on investment.

BETH DOIRON: Very true.

JIM PROULX: No. And I guess my point was what is industry doing to dovetail, like, you know, its hospitality or its health care or its energy, right? What are we doing as an industry to support the place that's going to produce the workers right now?

And we need more labs, and we need more instructors, and we need more seats, and we need more infrastructure. Seems to me that that's going to be an ongoing thing. And how can we partner with -- "we" being in general --

BETH DOIRON: Right.

JIM PROULX: -- with the source of those valuable, extremely valuable 21 bucks an hour back door?

BETH DOIRON: Yeah. Because those programs are very expensive to run. They are the most expensive programs --

JIM PROULX: Absolutely.

BETH DOIRON: -- to run.

JIM PROULX: Right.

MICHAEL KANE: All right. And Mike Somers raised his hand, and we all --

MIKE SOMERS: Yes, [Mike Somers.] And all of this is awesome and great. But if you don't have enough workers in the system, we're just passing people around. And at the end of the day, you're still -- I don't know, 15-, 20-, 30,000 workers short in the system.

So I would love for us to have a conversation -- I don't know how we get there -- how do we attract more workers? Because I can tell you that the number of students coming out of the high schools is less and less every single year.

So you're not going to do it just through kids coming out of high school. So how are we as a state going to put a serious effort behind bringing new talent to the state of New Hampshire?

MICHAEL KANE: I think we should talk about that.

JOHN HENNESSY: [John Hennessy], I'd echo that.

We have some breakout groups a couple years ago when a lot of us first joined the Board, and several people in that group had that same sentiment, Mike.

So, you know, attracting a larger pool to this Workforce of New Hampshire. We've got a lot to offer here. It would be a great discussion.

MICHAEL KANE: All right. Before we go on further, Jonathan Melanson has a super important announcement to make.

JONATHAN MELANSON: So I just wanted to on behalf of our office -- I know Mayor Lovett is retiring -- I think at the end of this year; that will conclude your time working with the State Workforce Innovation Board as at least a Board member, and I just wanted to thank you for all of your work, time that you've put in, and you've left some very big shoes to try to fill.

[Applause]

MICHAEL KANE: All right. If there's nothing else, Joe's been kicking me to read the last paragraph here. Again, for the record, this is Michael Kane,

Chairman of the Board. I would like to thank the members of the Board for their participation and attendance today - - our presenters and staff -- for putting this meeting together.

This concludes the duly noticed meeting of the State Workforce Innovation Board. This meeting has been recorded and was conducted in a manner compliant with RSA 91-A. Thank you to the members and the public for joining me for this duly-noticed meeting from the State Workforce Innovation Board. Please end the recording.

Oh, we need a motion to adjourn. Does anybody -

-

MIKE SOMERS: So move.

PARTICIPANT: Second.

PARTICIPANT: Second.

PARTICIPANT: Second.

MICHAEL KANE: Alrighty. All in favor?

COLLECTIVE: Aye.

[End of Proceedings]